



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,989	01/29/2001	Alexandros Makriyannis	UCON/150/PC/	1360

2543 7590 11/01/2002

ALIX YALE & RISTAS LLP
750 MAIN STREET
SUITE 1400
HARTFORD, CT 06103

EXAMINER

OSTRUP, CLINTON T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1614

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/701,989

Applicant(s)

MAKRIYANNIS ET AL.

Examiner

Clinton Ostrup

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

Response to Applicant's Amendment

All previous rejections have been withdrawn because of the amendments set forth in the amendment filed July 31, 2002, Paper No.7. However, applicants' amendment necessitated a new search and upon conducting a new search and reconsideration of the claimed subject matter, a Lack of Unity has been determined in the instant application and an election of species and election of an invention are required.

Lack of Unity

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-7, drawn to a method of using a composition.

Group II, claim(s) 8-14, drawn to a composition.

The inventions listed as Groups II and I do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Applicant is referred to Annex B of Appendix A1 of the MPEP (Administrative Instructions Under the PCT, "Unity of Invention"). Unity "exists only when there is a technical relationship among the

claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding claimed technical features. The expression "special technical features" is defined as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art." (Rule 13.2).

Whether a given technical feature defines a contribution may be reconsidered *a posteriori* on the basis of the results of the search of the prior art (subsections c(ii) and c(iii)); for Markush groups, subsection f(v) specifies that "when dealing with alternatives, if it can be shown that a least one Markush group alternative is not novel over the prior art, the question of unity of invention shall be reconsidered by the examiner."

The instant claims special technical feature is the compound of instant claim 8. The question of unity of invention has been considered by the examiner in view of an updated search necessitated by applicants amendment to independent claim 8; a review of US 4,497,827 and Calignano, et al., Inhibition of Intestinal Motility by Anandamide, an Endogenous Cannabinoid, European Journal of Pharmacology, makes clear that a least one claimed species is not novel over the prior art. Furthermore, applicants admit on page 15 of the specification that among the Accordingly, the prior art of record support restriction of the claimed subject matter into the following Groups: Group I, claim(s) 1-7, drawn to a method of using a composition. Group II, claim(s) 8-14, drawn to a composition.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Art Unit: 1614

The species are as follows: Claims 1-14 relate to so many possible compounds and the compounds of claims 7 and 14 do not even relate to the generic structure of claims 1 and 8, from which they depend because only halogen substituted alkyl aryls are claimed as a Z-group, whereas claims 7 and 14 claim hydroxy substituted aryl group as the Z-group.

Thus, applicants are required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species (one compound which is clearly identifiable) to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, (i.e. claims 1-7 of Group I or claims 8-14 of Group II) including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which claims are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner: Group I and Group II both correspond to the same species, however, the search and examination of the elected species will only be searched and examined to the extent that it reads on the elected Group.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or

Art Unit: 1614

corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The special technical feature is the generic compound of claim 1. However, the compound of claim 1 is not special. As discussed above, US 4,497,827 and Calignano, et al., Inhibition of Intestinal Motility by Anandamide, an Endogenous Cannabinoid, European Journal of Pharmacology clearly teach that a least one claimed species is not novel over the prior art.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clinton Ostrup whose telephone number is (703) 308-3627. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30am-5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel can be reached on (703) 308-4725. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Application/Control Number: 09/701,989


Page 6

Art Unit: 1614

308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Clinton Ostrup
Examiner
Art Unit 1614



October 30, 2002

THE SENIOR GRASS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1600

